

CHRONOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL EVENTS AND DOCUMENTS

Supplement to *THE WORLD TODAY*

Published twice a month by the Royal Institute of International
Affairs, Chatham House, St. James's Square, London, S.W.1

Annual subscription 12s. 6d. Per copy 6d.

Volume II. No. 3 (<i>New Series</i>)	January 21—February 3, 1946
CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF EVENTS	57
THE UNITED NATIONS MEETING IN LONDON	73
THE SOVIET LETTER TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL <i>re</i> PERSIA	84
MR. TRUMAN'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS	86

AFGHANISTAN. *Jan. 24.*—Russian agencies reported the arrest of Abdurahim Khan, Deputy Prime Minister, and several of his relatives on charges of activities against the Government.

ARGENTINA. *Jan. 22.*—The Government announced that they had liquidated two Axis firms, taken possession of 74 others, and intervened in 73.

Feb. 1.—The U.S. Chargé d'Affaires handed the Foreign Minister an *aide-memoire* stating that the United States took a serious view of a statement made by Col. Peron to the *New York Times* correspondent accusing the Embassy of assisting in smuggling arms into Argentina to aid the Colonel's opponents.

AUSTRALIA. *Jan. 25.*—The Minister for External Affairs, speaking in Melbourne, urged that the Security Council should not postpone dealing with questions submitted to it. If they were weak or frivolous the Council should say so, but if issues were not faced at the outset of U.N.O.'s career they would not be faced at all.

Jan. 31.—The Government, on behalf of the Commonwealth Governments concerned, conveyed to the U.S. Government proposals for a joint British Commonwealth Force of some 40,000 men to take part in the occupation of Japan, and the U.S. Government accepted them. The C-in-C. was an Australian, Gen. Northcott, and the countries contributing were the U.K., Australia, New Zealand, and India.

AUSTRIA. *Jan. 26.*—The Russian military authorities, by agreement with the Allied Council, began the expulsion from their zone of all Germans who before 1939 lived in the part of Germany forming the U.S. zone; also all Germans formerly living in Hungary, and Sudeten Germans from Southern Bohemia and Southern Moravia.

BRAZIL. *Jan. 22.*—Gen. Dutra's Cabinet was announced, to take office on Jan. 31, with Dr. Neves da Fontoura, Foreign Minister; Dr. Coimbra da Luz, Justice and Interior; Dr. da Costa Vidigal, Finance; Dr. Mandel, Agriculture; Dr. Negrao de Lima, Labour, Industry, and Commerce; and Prof. de Souza Campos, Education and Health. The first 3 were members of the Social Democratic Party.

Jan. 31.—General Dutra was inaugurated President of the Republic.

Feb. 4.—The Constituent Assembly met, and began the work of drafting a new Constitution.

BURMA. *Jan. 21.*—The first All-Burma Congress of the "Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League passed a resolution in Rangoon declaring complete independence as the goal of the Burmese.

Jan. 25.—The Government decided to release U. Saw, Prime Minister in December, 1941, and, as a special case, to take no further action against him.

CANADA. *Jan. 31.*—The Premier issued a statement setting out the Government's policy on price and wage control in the transition period, and announced that from Feb. 1 price ceilings on certain goods and services would be suspended.

CHILE. *Jan. 28.*—Labour demonstrations occurred in Santiago, and the police intervened. Eleven people were reported to have been killed.

Feb. 1.—The Ministers of Agriculture, Lands and Colonization, Education, and Economy and Commerce resigned, as the alliance of the Left parties (to which all belonged) had withdrawn its support from the Vice-President owing to his attitude to the strikers on Jan. 28.

Feb. 3.—A new Cabinet was sworn in, with Señor Ramirez, Minister of Finance; Admiral Marino, the Interior; Señor Fernandez, Foreign Affairs; Gen. Carasco, National Defence; Señor Moller, Justice; and Señor Mendoza, Agriculture.

CHINA. *Jan. 20.* Gen. Marshall visited Shanghai in connection with efforts to end the fighting in Honan and Kiangsu.

Jan. 22.—The truce commission, in Peking, ordered the forces of both sides to withdraw 20 miles from the fighting areas. Many reports of breaches of the truce reached Peking, though U.S. aircraft had already dropped nearly 250,000 leaflets on 31 towns.

Jan. 25.—Student demonstrations occurred in Chungking in protest against the civil war. Demands were made for the punishment of traitors, the release of political prisoners, and the return of Hong-kong and Macao.

Jan. 27.—The Democratic League withdrew from the all-party conference in Chungking, accusing the Government police of searching the homes of its delegates.

Jan. 28.—The Government promised an investigation of the League's charges and gave a pledge of regard for civil liberties.

Jan. 31.—The Conference in Chungking reached agreement on the constitution of a national assembly and the reorganization of the armed forces. The assembly was to have 2,050 members, i.e. 900 originally appointed (60 per cent of whom were Communists); 450 to be elected (including 150 from Manchuria and Formosa); and 700 to be nominated. The latter would include 220 from the Kuomintang, 190 Communists, 120 Democratic League members, 100 Youth Party, and 70 non-partisan members.

This body would meet on May 5 to adopt a new Constitution by a three-fourths majority.

The Government armies were to be reduced to 90 divisions, and the Communists to 20, after which all 110 divisions would be merged into one National Army.

CYPRUS. *Jan. 21.*—Eighteen trade union leaders were sentenced to a year's imprisonment for being members of the Pan-Cyprian Trade Union Committee, an unlawful association, charged with encouraging the overthrow of the Constitution and of the established Government.

Jan. 22.—A one-day general strike was called as a protest against the sentences.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA. *Jan. 25.*—The first party of 1,209 Sudeten Germans to leave for Germany since expulsions were suspended after the Berlin Conference was entrained for the U.S. zone, provided with food for 8 days, and allowed to take 1,000 marks a head.

DENMARK. *Jan. 30.*—The Prime Minister told the press that the Government had had, and still had, contact with the Soviet Government regarding Bornholm through the Russian Minister in Copenhagen and their Minister in Moscow, and "doubtless in due time an account will be issued of the negotiations now going on".

EGYPT. *Jan. 22.*—King Ibn Saud left for home. He told the press that Egypt was "truly the example and hope of all Arabs", and advised the Arabs to rally round the League.

Jan. 26.—The Ministers of Finance, War, and Supply (all of the *Kotla* bloc of the *Wafd*) resigned, following the Cabinet's refusal to accept the Finance Minister's proposal to disavow the statement by the Foreign Minister that the matters outstanding between Egypt and Britain were not yet questions for the United Nations.

News was received that a British reply had been handed to the Embassy in London to the Egyptian Note of Dec. 20 asking for the opening of negotiations for the revision of the Treaty. The King thereupon asked his Ministers to sink their differences in face of this vital national issue, and the three Ministers withdrew their resignations.

Jan. 30.—Publication of British Note of Jan. 26. (see *Great Britain.*)

The Egyptian Note was published. It said the manifest interests of Anglo-Egyptian friendship and alliance demanded that the two parties

should revise the arrangements governing their relations. The Treaty was concluded in the midst of an international crisis, at a moment when the spectre of war was already appearing, and "it is to those circumstances that it clearly owes its present form". Egypt only accepted it under the pressure of necessity and as a testimony to the loyalty and sincere desire for collaboration inspiring her. It thus appeared as a link in the chain of measures taken to prevent the war or to repel aggression if war came. If Egypt accepted the Treaty with all it implied in the way of restrictions on her independence, it was only because she knew they were of a transitory character.

In fact, the war had exhausted the principal objectives of the Treaty and opened the way for the adoption of a new system. The international events which had upset the world, the Allied victory, and the agreements designed to maintain the peace rendered several of its provisions superfluous and without justification.

Reference was made to the assistance given by Egypt during the war, from which Britain obtained more than the text of the Treaty stipulated and much more than the most optimistic British negotiators had been able to contemplate. As the circumstances had changed it was now necessary to revise the Treaty, as its clauses which detracted from the independence of Egypt no longer corresponded to present conditions.

The presence of foreign troops, even if stationed in distant areas, was "still wounding to national dignity" and could only be interpreted by public opinion as a tangible sign of a mistrust which the British Government, they believed, must regard as unjustified. Egypt would, moreover, shrink from no sacrifice in order to place her military potential in a state enabling her to repel aggression pending the arrival of the reinforcements of her allies and of the United Nations. For this reason, and in view of the unanimous urge of the Egyptian people and their desire to see their relations with Britain established on the basis of an alliance and friendship no longer inspired by past prejudices and out-of-date doctrines the Government were confident that the British Government would share these views and fix an early date for a delegation to proceed to London to negotiate the revision of the Treaty. "It goes without saying", it ended, "that the negotiations will include the question of the Sudan, and will be inspired by the interests and aspirations of the Sudanese."

Feb. 2.—The Wafd issued a manifesto declaring that the Notes exchanged with the British Government were a disaster unparalleled in Egyptian modern history, and "a shameful conspiracy threatening the future of Egypt". It asserted that Britain intended to add Egypt and the Sudan to the British Empire.

FINLAND. *Jan. 29.*—It was announced that the U.S. Government had granted Finland a credit of \$35 million to further trade between the two countries.

FRANCE. *Jan. 21.*—M.R.P. announced that they would not join a three-party coalition under Communist leadership. Gen. de Gaulle's

letter of resignation was published. He recalled his work for France—leading the country towards “liberation, victory, and sovereignty”, and announced his departure without explaining why that particular moment was chosen for it.

Jan. 22.—The Socialists and the Communists both proposed M. Gouin (Socialist) as Prime Minister to head a three-Party Government.

Jan. 23.—M. Gouin was elected head of the Government by the Assembly by 497 votes to 58.

M. Flandin was provisionally released from custody. M. Luchaire was condemned to death.

Jan. 26.—M. Gouin formed a Cabinet of 20—7 Socialists, 6 Communists, 6 M.R.P., and 1 Independent. They were: Vice-Premier, M. Thorez; Minister of State, M. Gay (M.R.P.); Foreign Minister, M. Bidault; Justice, M. Teitgen (M.R.P.); the Interior, M. le Troquer (Socialist); Finance, M. Philip (Socialist); the Army, M. Michelet (M.R.P.); War Production, M. Tillon (Communist); Agriculture, M. Tanguy-Prigent (Socialist); Industry, M. Paul (Com.); Education, M. Naegelen (Soc.); Public Works, M. Moch (Soc.); Colonies, M. Moutet (Soc.); Labour, M. Croizat (Com.); Health, M. Prigent (M.R.P.); Reconstruction, M. Billoux (Com.); Food, M. Longchambon (Ind.); Information, M. Deffere (Soc.); and War Veterans, M. Casanova (Com.).

Jan. 28.—M. Blum was appointed as Ambassador Extraordinary to undertake economic and financial missions abroad and to improve the food situation.

Jan. 29.—The National Assembly voted its confidence in the Government by 514 votes to 51, after M. Gouin had set out its programme and summed up “the hard realities to be faced”. In the finances very heavy sacrifices would be demanded but they would be distributed equitably. Of the 580 milliard francs worth of currency in circulation only 37 per cent was covered by normal assets. The 1946 budgetary deficit would be over 309 milliard francs, expenditure in 1945 having totalled 532 milliard. He promised large reductions in military expenditure.

Bread rationing would have to continue at least until the next harvest, wine rations would be reduced, and meat rations could not be increased. The effects of a bad potato crop had been worsened by inefficient harvesting. Urgent measures to prevent inflation would be presented to the Assembly, and would include massive reductions in civil and military expenditure and changes on the revenue side of the Budget.

In foreign policy he would follow the same general lines as Gen. de Gaulle, and he went on: “After having happily renewed with the Soviet Union a political alliance which has been a Republican tradition for so many years we mean now to achieve with Great Britain a mutual harmonizing of our relations. This should be the preface to a new alliance, which is highly desirable and might one day form part of a tripartite agreement with Russia”.

They desired the internationalization of the Ruhr and wanted to prevent the reconstitution of a centralized Germany. The Government

of Spain would not be fit to take its part in the assembly of nations until the Spanish people were once again on the path of democracy. France would carry out her task of protecting Spanish republican refugees.

Feb. 1.—The Finance Minister told the financial committee of the Assembly that he hoped to reduce military expenditure by 30 per cent, and said that "heroic measures" would have to be adopted to meet the deficit in the 1946 Budget.

Feb. 2.—*L'Humanité* reported M. Vishinsky's speech at length, but gave only a few lines to Mr. Bevin, whose speech was described as "a counter-attack which was nothing if not unconvincing".

GERMANY. *Jan. 21.*—M. Vishinsky arrived in Berlin.

Jan. 22.—Seven of the leading oil industrialists were arrested, owing to "the significant part they played in the organization of the mineral oil industry for war and their collaboration with the party to that end".

It was announced that the tripartite naval commission set up in accordance with the decisions of the Berlin Conference had reported to the British, U.S., and Soviet Governments recommending the division of the main units of the German Fleet into 3 equal parts, and that the Governments had accepted this.

Jan. 27.—Elections were held in Bavaria, Würtemberg, Hesse, and Greater Hesse to the local councils of 9,500 districts. Some 4 million went to the polls, and the Catholic "Christian Democrats" secured most votes, followed by the Social Democrats.

Jan. 28.—Twelve Germans, including 2 generals, were sentenced to be hanged for war crimes committed at Kiev.

Jan. 29.—The 12 Germans were hanged publicly at Kiev.

At Minsk 14 Germans, including 3 generals, were sentenced to be hanged for causing the death of tens of thousands of war prisoners and civilians.

Jan. 30.—The 14 Germans were hanged.

Jan. 31.—Eight Germans, including senior officers, were sentenced to death at Veliki-Luki for atrocities.

Feb. 1.—A World Federation of Trade Unions' delegation, visiting Berlin, began a study of trade unions in Germany.

Feb. 2.—Seven generals were executed at Riga for atrocities in the Baltic States; also the 8 officers convicted at Veliki-Luki.

The four occupying Powers announced in Berlin that they had reached general understanding on preventing the revival of war industries by banning 9 key industries including synthetic petrol and rubber manufacture. They had forbidden the manufacture of heavy agricultural tractors and machine tools and of aluminium, magnesium, synthetic ammonia, and certain chemicals.

GREAT BRITAIN. *Jan. 22.*—A White Paper was issued containing a statement of Government policy on the future constitution of the Malayan Union and Singapore. It was proposed to regroup the Straits Settlements and the Malay States to form two Administrations—the

Colony of Singapore and the Malayan Union, comprising the 9 Malay States; and the Settlements of Penang and Malacca.

The Ministry of Labour stated in Parliament that, despite transport delays in bringing men from oversea, the Government's promise of 1½ million releases by the end of 1945 had been carried out.

M. Vishinsky arrived in London.

Jan. 23.—Mr. Bevin said in Parliament that he was seriously concerned at the number of political murders that had been committed in Poland recently, in circumstances which in many cases appeared to point to the complicity of the Polish Security Police. "I regard it as imperative", he went on, "that the Polish Provisional Government should put an immediate stop to these crimes in order that free and unfettered elections may be held as soon as possible in accordance with the Crimea decisions." Replying to questions he said the task of recreating Europe was very difficult, and they must exercise patience; "at the same time", he said, "I am looking forward to the end of these police States".

Mr. Bevin also said that the Government were in consultation with the U.S. and French Governments regarding Spain. They had "on all relevant occasions displayed their dislike of the present régime, which abetted our enemies, and have forcibly enunciated their anxiety that the present régime should, by the activities of the Spanish people themselves, be superseded by a régime popularly supported".

The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on European Jewry and Palestine arrived from the U.S.A.

The Minister of Information left for Canada.

The Regent of Belgium arrived in London.

Jan. 24.—Mr. Byrnes left London for the U.S.A.

Jan. 25.—Sir Archibald Clark-Kerr was appointed Ambassador to the U.S.A.

Mr. Bevin announced in Parliament that an agreement had been concluded with Greece under which the Government were providing a credit of £10 million for the stabilization of Greek currency, no interest being charged and repayment not to begin till 1951. They were also waiving repayment of the £46 million they lent to Greece in 1940 and 1941, and were prepared to give that country all the assistance in their power in carrying through a programme of reconstruction; e.g. they were finding consumer goods, including clothing, to the value of £500,000; they would make available material from their military stocks for the repair of Greek land communications, the rebuilding of houses, and the restoration of harbours and docks; and also hoped to improve the position of coastal shipping.

All this would be of value, however, only if it formed part of a general stabilization and reconstruction plan undertaken by the Greek Government. It was intended to grapple with the problem of inflation, and steps would therefore be taken to control prices and the use of production, and to adjust wages, so as to assure real wages. The British Government were going to give technical assistance in doing this, and a highly qualified mission on financial, economic, and industrial matters

had been formed, and they were ready to appoint advisers to work in the Greek Ministries if desired. In making these arrangements they had received the utmost help from the U.S. Government, which had been kept fully informed, and the U.S. Embassy was represented at all the discussions with the Greek Ministers, MM. Tsouderos and Kartalis.

Jan. 28.—The Minister of State, replying to questions in Parliament, said it was known that Soviet forces were still on the Danish island of Bornholm. The Foreign Secretary considered that the question of their departure was a matter for direct settlement between the Governments of Denmark and the Soviet Union.

M. Sophianopoulos, the Greek Foreign Minister, left for Athens, after issuing a statement in the name of his Government in which he emphasized its desire to see unanimity of the great Powers consolidated, and suggested that Britain and Russia should exchange views on Greece. "The Greek Government", he said, "record their conviction that a sincere exchange of views between two of the principal contributors to the cause of victory and an exchange of reciprocal explanations will serve to dispel the misunderstandings that have arisen and will promote the general interest."

He pointed out that if the Council must discuss British policy in Greece the debate should not be extended to include the Greek political situation, since the political antagonisms there were a purely internal matter. He then said, "the Greek Government state that the British forces, whose continued presence in Greece is due to the initiative of successive Greek Governments and accords with the latter's wishes, are collaborating with the Greek authorities with a view to the gradual restoration of order and to the securing of a free expression of the people's will; and that this holds good until such time as these purposes have been fulfilled".

Replying to questions in Parliament the Minister of State said the Government proposed to work so that in the end there would be produced, in the U.N.O., the equivalent of a world government. That was the object they consciously and deliberately had in view in what they were trying to do.

Jan. 30.—The Government's reply to the Egyptian Note asking for a revision of the Treaty was published. It stated that it was the Government's policy to consolidate the close co-operation achieved by Egypt and the Commonwealth and Empire during the war and "to place it on a footing of full and free partnership, as between equals, in the defence of their mutual interests and with full respect for the independence and sovereignty of Egypt". The Government were therefore willing to undertake a review of the Treaty arrangements in the light of their mutual experience and with due regard to the provisions of the Charter. Instructions would soon be sent to the Ambassador to hold preliminary conversations in Cairo to that end. The Government took note that the Egyptian Government desired that the discussions should include the question of the Sudan.

The Government had not responded before to the known desire of the Egyptian Government for discussions because they wished to

examine the provisions of the Treaty in the light of the Charter and also of the lessons learnt by the war, and they now took leave to observe that one of these lessons was the essential soundness of the fundamental principles on which the Treaty was based. (*see also Egypt.*)

Jan. 31.—F.-M. Sir Bernard Montgomery was appointed Chief of the Imperial General Staff, with effect from June 26.

Announcement of an Empire force for Japan. (*see Australia.*)

Sir Alexander Cadogan was designated the permanent British representative on the Security Council at the seat of the United Nations.

Feb. 1.—Don Juan, the claimant to the Spanish throne, arrived in London.

Feb. 2.—Sir Maurice Peterson was appointed Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

GREECE. *Jan. 21.*—Some 3,000 more armed rebels, many of them belonging to X, were reported to be marching on Kalamata. Martial law was declared in Messinis and Lakoma (Sparta) provinces, and Government troops left for Kalamata. All X premises in Athens were occupied by the police.

In Kalamata order was restored, after a mixed force had landed from a destroyer, and the rebels retired to a stronghold in the hills, taking 190 hostages.

Jan. 22.—The Prime Minister, in a comment on the Russian request that the Security Council should discuss the presence of British troops, said: "The British troops are in Greece with the full consent of the Greek Government, and are acting in sincere co-operation with the Government for the re-establishment of order".

Government troops cleared Kalamata of the rebels, and the Minister of Justice stated that they had released 46 hostages who had been carried off by the rebels. Eight were believed to have been executed. The Communist press alleged that the leader of X was financed and instructed by British intelligence agents, and declared that "the Government has no right to a single gendarme without British permission".

Jan. 23.—Nearly all the Athens papers, excepting the Communist, declared that the withdrawal of British forces would not be justified. They had come at the request and with the consent of successive Governments. "The National Union" (Liberals and Populists) issued a statement protesting against the Soviet action, and declaring that the departure of British forces would be a violation of the Allies' guarantee of Greece's independence and integrity given in April, 1939.

An E.A.M. delegation visited the U.S. and Soviet Embassies and asked for their Governments' support in securing the departure of the British forces.

Jan. 24.—The civil servants' strike ended, after a compromise on the question of increases in pay.

Jan. 25.—The Foreign Affairs Committee endorsed the policy of the Government regarding the Russian complaint to U.N.O., and telegraphed to the Security Council accordingly.

The official exchange rate of the drachma was fixed at 20,000 to the pound and 5,000 to the dollar.

Jan. 28.—The Foreign Minister's statement in London. (*see Great Britain.*) The Prime Minister said that M. Sophianopoulos, by his statement, had placed himself in a position "in which it would be difficult for him to justify his position in the Cabinet".

Jan. 29.—M. Rendis was appointed Foreign Minister, and succeeded as Minister of the Interior by M. Havinis. The Premier stated that M. Sophianopoulos' disobedience to Government orders and his abandonment of the task he had been assigned to carry out amounted to a *de facto* resignation.

Feb. 2.—The head of the Communist Party, in a party paper, said there could be no free elections as long as the British were in Greece, and declared that the British could have restored order within 24 hours if they had wanted to. "Throughout Greece", he went on, "the X organization has been supplied with British arms in the last few days".

The E.A.M. issued a statement asking the Security Council to send a special commission to Greece "to note that democratic conditions do not exist, and the White terror continues".

M. Rendis left for London, to lead the U.N. delegation.

HUNGARY. *Feb. 1.*—Dr. Tildy was elected President of the Republic by the National Assembly.

INDIA. *Jan. 21.*—The new Central Legislative Assembly met and passed a motion for adjournment in censure of the Government for permitting the employment of Indian troops in Java.

Jan. 23.—Rioting occurred in Bombay when the police prevented a Hindu procession (celebrating the 50th anniversary of the birth of Subhas Chandra Bose) from entering the Muslim quarter. The police had to fire, and 11 people were killed and over 300 injured, including a British Commissioner of Police and nearly 40 policemen. The Communist Party's premises were attacked by demonstrators, who did much damage.

The British Parliamentary mission saw Mr. Gandhi.

Jan. 24.—Disturbances continued during the funeral of men killed the previous day. Two persons were killed and 60 injured.

Jan. 25.—Casualties in Bombay increased to 22 killed and over 600 injured. A curfew was imposed and meetings of more than 5 persons prohibited in the disturbed areas. Several shops in the European quarter and in Hindu streets were looted, and the police had to fire 5 times.

Jan. 28.—The Viceroy, addressing the Legislative Assembly, said he could not enter into any details at the moment of the methods by which the new Executive Council and Constitution-making body would be formed, nor did he think it wise to set a date or dates for the steps to India's freedom. He could only assure them that these had a priority label in Delhi and Whitehall, and he asked for their "co-operation and goodwill in our great task".

If some members thought it right to vote against the Government on almost every issue and believed it was their political duty to do so he had nothing to say, but "I do claim", he said, "that you should not in the course of your debates say anything which may reduce the chances of my forming a political Executive Council, affect adversely the prospects of a settlement on the main constitutional issues, or increase the bitterness already abroad in the country. Enough, and more than enough animosity has been caused during the elections to the Central Assembly. . . ."

If he was successful in forming a new Executive Council with the support of the principal parties Members of the Assembly would have a great deal of important constructive work at their next session.

The Congress Party Members did not attend.

Mr. Jinnah told the press afterwards that "the Muslim League will not agree to any central Government being set up even as an interim arrangement, as it is obvious that it will constitute the thin end of the wedge and will relegate to the background the main issue—the demand for *Pakistan*. Further, once an interim arrangement is jammed in we feel that it will put off the day of India's freedom—not only of Muslims but other nationalities as well".

Jan. 29.—Figures reaching the Food Department of the Government showed that serious famine was threatened unless some 2 million tons of food grains were imported during 1946.

The Legislative Assembly recorded its disapproval of the Government's action in making India a member of the International Monetary Fund and International Bank without first securing its assent.

Feb. 1.—The Government spokesman stated in the Assembly that famine was threatening.

IRAQ. *Jan. 31.*—The Cabinet resigned.

ITALY. *Jan. 26.*—A decree of the Ministry of Foreign Trade gave legal form to the devaluation of the lira for purposes of trading abroad, making the pound worth 900 lire, and the dollar 225 lire. It provided for the addition of a premium of 125 per cent to the official rates of 400 to the pound and 100 to the dollar.

JAPAN. *Jan. 21.*—Allied troops took over 394 industrial plants, services' arsenals, laboratories, etc., as a first instalment of reparations.

Jan. 25.—The commandant of a prisoner camp in Hokkaido was sentenced to be hanged for causing the death of 4 British and Dutch prisoners.

Jan. 28.—The Government accepted the resignations of 24 of the 47 prefectural governors, in accordance with Gen. MacArthur's order of Jan. 4. (Four had resigned already.)

Jan. 29.—Sixty Members of the House of Peers, including 15 Imperial Princes, resigned in accordance with the same order.

Feb. 1.—The first British occupation troops landed at Kure.

JAVA. *Jan. 21.*—Mr. Sjahrir told the press that they appreciated world interest in Java, but would prefer British forces to remain until the Japanese had been removed.

Jan. 22.—A nationalist official in Batavia stated that the Ukrainian Government's request to the United Nations was "clumsy and unhelpful". So far as the "National Government" was concerned the British had never exceeded the role laid down at the Berlin Conference. Their troops had not fired except in self-defence. Their task had always been the restoration and maintenance of law and order, and how such actions could be described as any sort of threat to world peace was inconceivable.

Mr. Sjahrir stated that "any request for the withdrawal of British troops must be coupled with a demand that the disarmament of the Japanese should be handed over to the Peace Preservation Corps. If this duty is handed over to the Indonesians it will be possible for the British to leave at any time". He added that the Ukrainian action was neither known nor expected by him.

Over 150 Dutch and Eurasian internees arrived in Batavia from a nationalist controlled internment camp in East Java, escorted by men of the Peace Preservation Corps.

Jan. 26.—Dr. van Mook arrived back in Batavia.

Feb. 1.—Sir Archibald Clark-Kerr arrived in Batavia.

Feb. 3.—Sir Archibald Clark-Kerr had a discussion with M. Sjahrir. Fighting occurred near Klebek, central Java.

KENYA. *Jan. 30.*—A conference in Nairobi attended by over 100 delegates of British settlers supported the Elected Members' rejection of the White Paper proposals. It adopted a resolution on self-government suggesting a Constitution similar to Rhodesia's but with communal representation.

MALAYA. *Jan. 22.*—British policy on future constitution of Malayan Union. (*see Great Britain.*)

Jan. 29.—Mr. Malcolm MacDonald was appointed Governor-General of the Malayan Union and the colony of Singapore, and Sir Edward Gent Governor and C.-in-C. of the Malayan Union.

NORWAY. *Feb. 1.*—Election of Hr. Trygve Lie as Secretary-General of U.N.O. (*see The United Nations.*) It was announced that Hr. Lie would be succeeded as Foreign Minister by Hr. Halvard Lange.

PALESTINE. *Jan. 22.*—Nine suspects were detained in Jerusalem, and 26 at Hadera. A British conservator of forests was stabbed and seriously injured in Jerusalem by an unknown Arab.

The Arab Higher Committee issued a statement declaring that "the Arab people do not consider that they are called upon to shelter a people who are using every means to overwhelm them and destroy their existence in their home country", and it could not consent to the

proposal for Jewish immigration to continue on the White Paper basis of 1,500 a month while the Anglo-American Commission was sitting.

Jan. 23.—Haifa port was cleared of civilians at night, and Telaviv was declared out of bounds for British police except on duty. Traffic checks were established at cross roads in many parts of the country.

Jan. 25.—The Jewish Agency for Palestine made representations to the British Government expressing surprise at the announcement regarding Transjordan's independence, since that country was still within the scope of the Palestine Mandate. Its future should, therefore, not be dealt with separately from that of Palestine.

Armed Jews, believed to belong to *Irgun Zvai Leumi* looted a store at Telaviv.

Jan. 28.—An extraordinary *Gazette* announced new measures against terrorism, including the death penalty for belonging to a terrorist group and life imprisonment for unlawfully wearing military uniform.

A R.A.F. camp was raided by 15 Jews dressed in R.A.F. uniform at Aqir and 200 machine-guns stolen. They were recovered later.

Jan. 30.—A Government *communiqué* was issued saying that consultations with the Arabs had proceeded over a long period "with inconclusive results", and the British Government, in order to ensure no interruption of Jewish immigration pending the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry, had decided that they must allow immigration to continue provisionally at the rate of 1,500 a month.

The Arab Higher Committee protested against the decision, pointing out that the Arab countries and Palestine Arabs rejected the proposal on grounds already stated in their memorandum submitted to the Government on Jan. 20.

The Jewish Agency said the decision must cause deep disappointment, and was "an outrage to the feelings of martyred Jews and cruel prolongation of the agony of survivors". There was no provision in the Mandate requiring the British Government to consult Arabs on the size of Jewish immigration, and that immigration was a right and was not on sufferance.

Underground newspapers of *Hagana* announced that plans were being made to land in 1946 nearly five times the number of illegal immigrants as were landed in 1945. Troops and police searched 4 Jewish quarters north of Telaviv and detained 2 men.

Jan. 31.—The whole Jewish population stopped work for 3 hours and held mass meetings demanding unrestricted immigration. The Government decided to release on Feb. 3 the 982 illegal immigrants who were found in the *Enzo Sereni*.

Feb. 1.—The Arab Higher Committee declared a protest strike for 24 hours and also protested against the continuance of immigration as a violation of the 1939 White Paper. It appealed for the intervention of the Arab States to secure the immediate abolition of the Mandate.

Feb. 3.—Arms were stolen from an R.A.F. leave camp at Telaviv by 8 armed Jews in battledress.

PERSIA. *Jan. 21.*—M. Hakimi and his Cabinet resigned, stating that Persia's case was now in U.N.O.'s hands.

Jan. 23.—The "Azerbaijan Autonomous Government" announced that it would frame its own foreign trade policy and enter into agreements with neighbouring countries.

Jan. 26.—M. Qawam es Sultaneh was elected Prime Minister by the *Majlis* by 53 votes to 51, and was reported to have at once sent "urgent instructions" to the Ambassador in London. He told the press that he would not withdraw the appeal to U.N.O. as he regarded the approach to the Council as a *fait accompli*. On the other hand, he intended also to open direct negotiations with Russia, which was compatible with the provisions of the Charter.

Second Note to the Security Council. (*see The United Nations.*)

Jan. 29.—The Premier sent a message to Mr. Attlee saying he was anxious to express to him "the feelings of sincere friendship of the Persian people towards the Government and people of Britain", and to assure him that he was "firmly resolved to use all my efforts towards a close co-operation with his Majesty's Government within the framework of the principles of the U.N. Charter and in conformity with the spirit and the letter of the Teheran *communiqué*, just as Persia has done during the war in order to ensure the success of the common cause. . . ."

The Soviet authorities handed over control of the railways in Azerbaijan, Mazanderan, and Kazvin, including the main line from Teheran to Kazvin, Mianeh, and Tabriz.

POLAND. *Jan. 23.*—Mr. Bevin's statement about murders in Poland. (*see Great Britain.*)

Jan. 24.—The Foreign Under-Secretary of State told the press in London that acts of political violence were being committed in Poland on instigation from abroad, and in 3 months alone 900 members of the Workers' Party (his own party) and 250 of the Socialist Party had been killed by political opponents. A representative of the Peasant Party, also present, said that not all the victims of these murders were members of his party, and the Socialist Minister of Labour and Social Welfare said he regretted that Mr. Bevin had endorsed unfounded accusations as to the complicity of the Security Police.

Feb. 2.—The Roman Catholic Bishop of Danzig was sentenced by a People's Court to 8 years' imprisonment for collaboration with the enemy.

PORTUGAL. *Feb. 3.*—Don Juan arrived in Lisbon and was received by the Spanish Ambassador.

SIAM. *Jan. 30.*—The National Assembly elected Kuang Aphaiwong as Prime Minister, the first elected member of the Assembly to hold the office.

Jan. 31.—The King commanded Kuang Aphaiwong to be Premier.

TANGIER. *Jan. 27.*—The C.-in-C. of the British Mediterranean

Fleet arrived in Tangier and called on the Mendoub, the U.S. Minister, and the Administrator of the International Zone.

U.S.A. *Jan. 21.*—The steel strike was estimated to be costing the nation 200,000 tons a day and the steel industry \$10 million a day in gross revenue.

President Truman's Message to Congress. (*see page 86.*)

Jan. 22.—Mr. Dean Acheson, speaking to the press about the Kurile Islands, said that when a nation was interested in an area and wanted it as a strategic area it must propose this to the Security Council for negotiation. Trusteeship of strategic areas could be changed and achieved only by the unanimous vote of all the 5 big Powers. The occupation of the Kuriles by Russia was agreed upon at the Crimea Conference, but it was only an occupation agreement, his impression being that it was not an award. He added that the Russian occupation might become permanent.

Jan. 23.—The American Federation of Labour decided to send a message to all the Members of Congress urging them to approve the loan to Britain as a business proposition.

Jan. 27.—Comment in Washington on the Moscow claim to the Kurile Islands was to the effect that Mr. Byrnes had stated in September, 1945 that the U.S. Government would oppose the claim.

Jan. 29.—Mr. Byrnes told the press that the agreement on the Kuriles was reached at Yalta, after he left, by the Chiefs of Staff, and was kept a "top secret". His own opinion was that the Russians had a claim to them, and he supported this. A definite settlement would have to be made at the peace conference, and the U.S.A. would then support the Russian claim.

Jan. 30.—President Truman sent a Message to Congress asking for speedy approval of the \$3750 million credit for Britain, who needed it and needed it now. The agreement would "set the course of American-British economic relations for many years to come. In so doing it will have decisive influence on the international trade of the whole world . . . It is essential to the life and work of the British people". From their own point of view its most important purpose was to cause the removal of the emergency controls exercised by the U.K. over its international transactions far more speedily than was required by the Bretton Woods Agreement. It would enable the U.K., through the relaxation of exchange restrictions, to move side by side with the United States towards the common goal of expanded world trade, which meant expanded production, consumption, and employment. Other nations would also be able to relax their restrictions once Britain had led the way.

Feb. 2.—The Under-Secretary for Agriculture, in a broadcast to the nation, said the world wheat situation was so serious that mass starvation was possible in Europe. Some sections of American economy might have to return temporarily to war-time conditions. Mr. Dean Acheson, also broadcasting, said that in some countries the situation was

so bad that wheat and flour stocks were sufficient only for a fortnight's bread supply. He appealed to everyone to avoid all waste of bread.

It was stated in Washington that Europe needed 17 million tons of wheat before July, but only 12 million tons were in sight, half of which would be supplied by the United States.

U.S.S.R. *Jan. 21.*—An E.A.M. delegation arrived in Moscow.

Request for inquiry into British action in Greece and Java. (*see The United Nations Meeting.*)

Jan. 22.—Official figures of the population gave it as 193 million, of whom over 100 million had been born since the Revolution.

Jan. 24.—The U.S. Ambassador left for Chungking. Moscow radio broadcast extracts from an article in *Bolshevik* which stated that if the peoples of Indonesia and Indo-China had to deal only with their former colonial masters they would have been able relatively easily to free themselves. The significance of the latest events there lay in the fact that the broad masses of the people did not wish to return to the colonial oppression of the past, and "do not wish to live in slavery". British intervention could be explained by the incentive of British capital in the exploitation of the Dutch East Indies and by the fear that the liberation movement would spread to other countries.

Jan. 25.—M. Vishinsky's letter to the President of the Security Council. (*see page 84.*)

Jan. 26.—Moscow radio broadcast a Tass statement declaring that the Crimean Agreement of February, 1945 provided that the Soviet Union should receive the Kurile Islands as well as South Sakhalin from Japan.

Jan. 27.—Sir Archibald Clark-Kerr left Moscow for Java, as special envoy of the British Government.

Jan. 30.—Moscow radio commentators said "the bloody acts of terror committed by Fascist gangs in Greece and the coups staged by the Royalists are distracting the country's attention from the work of rehabilitation. Nor is the accomplishment of this work advanced by the presence in Greece of foreign troops, which have come to be the means of bringing pressure to bear on the political situation in the country. . . ."

Feb. 3.—Moscow radio broadcast a report of Mr. Bevin's speech in the Security Council omitting his references to the Communist attacks on Britain published in Russia and in other countries.

The *New Times* declared that the Greek situation was "pregnant with peril for the cause of peace". It was not just a question of open intervention by a great Power in the affairs of a small State; it was "a fact that Monarchist Fascist elements are, under the protection of foreign bayonets, planning adventures against their neighbours, thus menacing the peace of south-east Europe." Regarding Java, it said the situation was unbearable from the viewpoint of the interest of general peace and security. It also said there was no justification for the existence of the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine.

Pravda said that the Persian question, having been artificially raised

before the Security Council, had, by the victory of common sense, been removed from the agenda. "Vishinsky's clear and detailed case spiked all attempts to push the United Nations along a path of policy conflicting with its statutes".

VENEZUELA. *Jan. 25.*—The President of the Revolutionary Government announced that they recognized the legality of the law of 1943 regulating relations between Venezuela and the companies holding oil concessions, and would impose no further taxes on capital.

YUGOSLAVIA. *Jan. 23.*—The police raided the house of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb and seized Church records.

THE UNITED NATIONS MEETING IN LONDON

Jan. 21.—The Soviet Government presented a Note to the Security Council asking that body to consider the situation in Greece, and the Ukrainian Government made a similar request as regards Indonesia. The first stated that the Soviet delegation considered it "necessary to discuss in the Security Council the situation which has arisen in Greece. The maintenance of British troops in Greece after the end of the war cannot now be explained by the necessity for protecting the communications of the British troops in defeated countries. Moreover, the maintenance of British troops in Greece has become a means of pressure on the internal political situation in the country, which is not seldom used by reactionary elements against the democratic forces of the country. This situation, which means interference with the internal affairs of Greece with the aid of the armed forces of a foreign Power, has created great tension, which is fraught with grave consequences for the Greek people as well as for the maintenance of peace and security". In view of this the Security Council was asked to discuss this question and to take such measures as were provided for in the Charter.

The Ukrainian Note drew the Council's attention, under Article 35 of the Charter, to the situation which had arisen in Indonesia, and said "As is known, in that country during several months military actions directed against the local population have been waged, in which regular British forces as well as Japanese enemy armed forces are taking part. In the opinion of the Ukrainian Government this situation creates a state of threat to the maintenance of international peace and security. . . ."

The Political and Security Committee approved a resolution, sponsored by the 5 major Powers and Canada, recommending the setting up of a commission on atomic energy. The Commission would make recommendations as well as an inquiry, and report to the Security Council.

The Committee on Trusteeship began a debate on the Preparatory Commission's recommendations. The French delegate explained how certain French colonies enjoyed extensive powers of government through their general councils, and also had representation in the National Assembly. The Cameroons and Togoland were taking part in Paris in the drafting of a new Constitution.

The New Zealand Premier pointed out that the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand had definitely accepted trusteeship, but he did not understand France's position. It was generally agreed at San Francisco that Mandate-holding Powers should recognize the authority of the Trusteeship Council, and France then made no reservations. Unless they had a frank acceptance of the Charter they were wasting time.

The Committee on Social and Humanitarian Affairs approved the recommendation of the Preparatory Commission for the setting up of a commission on human rights.

Jan. 22.—In the Committee on Trusteeship the Syrian delegate declared that the French action in the Cameroons and Togoland meant annexation by "unilateral accomplished fact", to which the Assembly would be asked to agree.

The British Colonial Under-Secretary drew attention to the fact that action might suitably be taken by other colonial Powers who did not hold any Mandates, quite apart from the Committee's job of appointing the Trusteeship Council as soon as possible.

The High Commissioner for South Africa reiterated his Government's attitude to the former German S.W. Africa. This was originally part of the old Cape Colony and was to-day part of the metropolitan area of the Union. The local legislature had asked to be incorporated into the Union. The inhabitants would be given the opportunity to express their desire freely, and when this had been done the decision would be communicated to the U.N. Assembly.

The New Zealand Premier said the South African statement was a very considerable step forward, and did at least recognize the moral right to inform the world through the Assembly of what had been done. But the Mandatory Powers were parties to the Charter, and they should therefore frankly recognize the trusteeship system and then make any other permanent arrangements.

The Economic and Financial Committee discussed the U.K. resolution on U.N.R.R.A. urging that States signatory to the U.N.R.R.A. agreement should contribute a further 1 per cent of their national income and that other States should join it.

Jan. 23.—The Economic and Social Council held its first meeting and elected Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar as president.

The Trusteeship Committee met, and the French delegate read a statement saying that "the French Government affirms that it intends to pursue the execution of the mission confided to it by the League of Nations, which is in the spirit of the Charter, that this mission shall be carried out from now on under the régime of trusteeship, and that it is prepared to state the terms of agreement to define this régime in the case of Togoland and the Cameroons. The French delegation also

adheres to the particularly impressive passage of Mr. Fraser's speech in which he affirmed that no Power will have the moral right to appropriate without due cause the territories placed under its administration after the war of 1914-18. That can be taken for granted . . . France, having signed the Charter of the United Nations, will respect both the letter and spirit of that Charter".

Baron van Asbeck said that in the proposals before the Assembly there was a gap which needed to be filled—that between the winding up of the League and the conclusion of the trusteeship agreements. Annexation was distinctly forbidden, but incorporation under terms of equality was possibly permissible. In the difficult question of how to preserve equality in incorporation the Trusteeship Council could be helpful.

Jan. 24.—The Assembly accepted unanimously the report of its Political and Security Committee on the setting up of a commission to make recommendations for the control and peaceful development of atomic energy. Mr. Byrnes, who moved its adoption, said the United Nations were now committed to remain united to preserve their common peace. The problems presented by the atom bomb and other forces capable of mass destruction could not be solved by any one nation, and each of them must do their part in dealing with them. In meeting them they must realize that their common interests in preserving the peace far outweighed any possible conflict in interest that might divide them. They must seek with all their hearts and all their minds means of reconciling their views and interests, for peace and reconciliation could not be achieved by unilateral action. That was why the more common tasks they set for themselves the more likely they were to come to understand each other's problems.

They must get back to conditions of peace if they were to consider this and other problems in the spirit of peace and reconciliation. Armies of occupation would be necessary in Germany and Japan for some time to come, but it would not make for a peaceful world to have them in countries which they hoped would soon join the United Nations. They must see that peace treaties with Germany's unwilling partners were concluded promptly.

The Polish Foreign Under-Secretary said that if the peoples gave their support to the work of the United Nations on this matter they would lend weight and authority to the organ set up to deal with it.

M. Vishinsky considered the draft resolution fully corresponded to the interests of U.N.O. The commission was to be set up by the Assembly, so that the rights and powers of the latter were fully protected. On the other hand, the commission was to consist of the representatives of the member States of the Security Council and Canada, and this suggestion corresponded to the powers and functions of the Council. He then reminded the meeting of the terms of Article 24 of the Charter, and said that thus the measures outlined in the resolution expressed the realistic approach to the solution of the atomic energy problem.

The Committee on Trusteeship began consideration of the U.S.

amendment to the Preparatory Commission's draft resolution. The amendment was supported by Australia, Brazil, and China, and opposed by Russia.

Jan. 25.—The Security Council met and decided to put the three appeals on the agenda for Jan. 28, and that the Persian, Greek, and Ukrainian delegations should be present when the cases came up and speak as invited by the Council. M. Vishinsky asked whether this meant that the Council had decided to enter into the matter of Persia fully, or only that it was on the agenda? In other words, would the Soviet objections to having it discussed be heard? The chairman replied that M. Vishinsky would have full opportunity to move in any direction he wished; the matter would be brought up, and the Council would decide how to proceed.

Mr. Bevin urged that the complainants should be heard, as "it would be a mistake if a Government, feeling it had a complaint against any Power, great or small, could not come to this Council and state its case . . . I believe that peace depends on bringing these facts out before the world, whether they are right or whether they are wrong".

Mr. Stettinius said he wished to "make it very clear that the U.S. Government believes that any member country of the United Nations who makes a complaint has the right to be heard at this table", and the Egyptian delegate supported this. Dr. van Kleffens said the Dutch Government had no objection to seeing the question of Java put on the agenda for the next session.

The Yugoslav delegate asked that Albania should be admitted as a member of the United Nations, and was supported by Russia and Poland.

M. Vishinsky's letter to the president of the Security Council. (*see text, page 84.*)

Jan. 26.—The Assembly met to consider reports submitted by 4 committees. It decided, on the recommendation of the general committee, to set up 2 *ad hoc* committees, to consider the transfer of certain functions and assets of the League of Nations, and to consider the site of the U.N. headquarters. A recommendation of the legal committee to add to the rule providing for elections by secret ballot a provision that there should be no nominations was agreed by 25 votes to 18.

The Persian Government submitted to the Security Council a detailed reply to the Soviet Note of Jan. 24, making the following main points:—

(1) The continued interference by Soviet military and civil authorities in the internal affairs of Persia could be fully proved.

(2) The Soviet Government, in a Note of Nov. 26, 1945, admitted that it had not been willing to allow the passage of Persian reinforcements to suppress the revolt, on the clearly unjustifiable ground that they would cause disturbance and bloodshed, constraining Russia to increase her forces. But according to the definition of aggression given by M. Litvinov in the Disarmament Conference on Feb. 6, 1933, revolutionary movements or other events of that character in one country were no excuses for aggression by another.

(3) Both the British and United States Governments made representations to the Soviet Government regarding Soviet interference with the movement of Persian troops.

(4) The Persian Note of Dec. 1 was not correctly quoted or translated in the letter of the Soviet delegate. The sense had been so altered that it was exactly the opposite of what was said in the Note.

(5) Attempts by the Persian Government to negotiate with the Soviet Government were unsuccessful. The offer of the Persian Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs to go to Moscow was ignored.

(6) The Persian Government had not tried to use the presence of foreign troops to represent this fact as a breach of Persian sovereignty but as a direct cause of the inability of the Persian Government to restore law and order in Azerbaijan.

(7) The delegation denied that there had been in Persia any propaganda hostile to Russia or that any such propaganda had been encouraged by the Persian Government.

(8) In the circumstances, the Persian delegation maintained that the conditions envisaged by Article 25 of the Charter were present, and that the Security Council should, in accordance with the terms of the Charter, investigate this dispute between the Persian Government and the Soviet Government.

Jan. 28.—The Security Council, dealing with the Persian appeal, agreed that her delegate should be present, and Mr. Taqizadeh took his seat and, after M. Vishinsky had declared that "we limit the discussion to the procedural side of the matter", stated Persia's case. The Government, he said, had sent several Notes to the Soviet Government setting out interventions in breach of Persian independence, and in December the Prime Minister offered to go to Moscow to seek a solution, but this offer was refused.

The Russians had carried out a policy of interfering with the administration so far that the Persian Government was prevented from exercising any part whatever in certain areas. The security authorities were prevented from exercising their functions of preventing disorders; economic life had been disrupted; merchandise could pass only at Russian discretion; and Persian forces were not allowed to pass. Whole districts were no longer under the control of the Government, which was unable to send troops to restore order because of the action of the Soviet authorities. This was a breach of the Tripartite Treaty.

Persia asked that this interference should stop, and that the Council should recommend that all moral and material support for the rebels should be withdrawn. Furthermore, all Soviet troops should be out of the country by March 2.

M. Vishinsky said he would deal with the procedural aspect of the matter. He would bring proofs to show that the facts presented by the Persian Government—a Government no longer in power—were claims which had not sufficient grounds. The questions raised by Persia were included in 2 letters which he did not think were fit to be discussed by the Council because they did not meet the qualifications specified in the Charter. But this was of secondary importance. What was necessary

was to decide whether the Council must concern itself with the complications in the situation existing between Persia and the U.S.S.R. As to the procedural aspect there were 2 points: to ascertain whether there had been negotiations between the two Governments; and the results of such negotiations. The Persian delegate had just recognized that not only did Persia try to enter into negotiations, but negotiations had actually taken place; they had been entered into by both parties. If this was admitted they could deal with the second aspect: what had been the result of these negotiations? They had found their completion in the Persian document dated Dec. 1. After that date the Persian Government did not deem it necessary to supply the necessary data for further negotiations.

The Teheran agreement was a testimonial on the nature of the relations at that date between the two Governments. Before Dec. 1 a Persian Note contained several claims, explanations, and requests for further explanations. After the Soviet Government had explained the situation and corrected mis-statements in the Persian letter the Persian Government expressed the wish no longer to discuss the situation and its satisfaction at the explanations given by Moscow.

It could not, then, be said that the negotiations had brought no result. They could take it for granted that results were actually obtained even from the fact that the Persian Government no longer maintained the claims stated in its previous declaration.

The Note of Dec. 14 from Teheran proposing a visit to Moscow by the Prime Minister was entirely different from the previous one and the claims made in November. It said, in effect, that Persia had learnt of the conference to be held in Moscow and expressed the wish for Russia's permission for the Premier to go there to submit his case. This proved that the sending of the Premier to Moscow was closely connected, in the view of the Persian Government, with the Moscow conference.

M. Vishinsky repeated that the negotiations *had* brought results. The Persian delegation now did not think they were satisfactory, but at the beginning of December the Note they sent to Moscow clearly stated that they thought the results satisfactory and refused to go on with further consultations. In view of all this, was there actually, he asked, a basis for consideration of the matter as it lay in its present stage by the Security Council?

He then cited Articles 33, 34, 36, and 37 of the Charter to show that there were no grounds for the Council to concern itself with the matter. The Soviet delegation and the Soviet Government accordingly asked the Council to leave the matter aside and to leave it open for a solution by negotiation between the two parties. He concluded by saying that "first and last, I maintain that the Soviet Government never refused to continue consultations and to leave it open for negotiation would be the most dignified course to be taken by the U.N. Organization".

Jan. 29.—The Security Council unanimously agreed to recommend Hr. Trygve Lie, the Norwegian Foreign Minister, for the office of Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The Political and Security Committee completed its work by agreeing on language rules, with French and English as the working languages, and Chinese, French, English, Russian, and Spanish as the official languages.

The Economic and Financial Committee adopted unanimously a resolution emphasizing the "imperative urgency" of facilitating the final stages of the work of U.N.R.R.A. It recommended that the Assembly should set up a committee to urge States which had signed the U.N.R.R.A. agreement to make the increased contribution of 1 per cent of their national income and to urge non-signatories to join it.

The General Committee, by 7 votes to 6 with 4 abstentions, decided to recommend to the Assembly that representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions should be allowed to take part in the Economic and Social Council in a consultative capacity.

The Legal and the Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Committees adopted the reports submitted.

Jan. 30.—The Security Council adopted unanimously a resolution put forward by Mr. Bevin and amended during discussion. It approved direct negotiations between Russia and Persia, stated that the Council requested the parties to inform it of any results achieved in such negotiations, and declared that "the Council in the meantime retains the right to request information on the progress of the negotiations at any time". As originally submitted it provided also for the question remaining on the agenda, but in deference to Soviet objections put forward with vehemence by M. Vishinsky, the words "the question will remain on the agenda" were deleted.

The U.S. delegate agreed to this alteration "with the understanding that this matter remains of continuing concern to the Council until a settlement is reached in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter".

Before this the Persian delegate made a statement refuting the two Soviet contentions that there had been negotiations between the two countries, which were concluded with expressions of satisfaction by Persia; and that as there had been negotiations the matter ought not to be brought to the Council. He insisted that there had never been any direct negotiations for settlement of the dispute. The Persian Notes requested that their forces should be allowed to go through. The Soviet Notes rejecting this could not be called "direct negotiations". There was no trace of satisfaction to be found in the Persian Note. Persia certainly sought direct negotiations, but without avail; if the Soviet delegate wanted to say that the Notes were negotiations, then even if that was true, there had been no result.

He maintained that the matter could not be dismissed and must not be dismissed by the Council; in no circumstances must it go out of its hands. Persia was, however, ready to negotiate direct if the Council recommended that way. Progress should then be reported to it from time to time.

M. Vishinsky declared that Persia admitted that negotiations had taken place but said they were not "direct negotiations", and this he

denied, and went on to make the following points: his Government, after consideration, came to the definite conclusion that the events in north Persia were not the result of the presence of Soviet troops. The Russian High Command had protested against the movement of troops in that part of Persia: the presence of additional forces might have led, not to the restoration of order, but to a complication of the situation which might have endangered the position of the Russian troops.

In view of the fact that Persia was not discussed at the Moscow Conference it was unnecessary for the Persian Premier to visit Moscow. The Hakimi Government had "adopted again and again an attitude contrary to Russian interests". M. Vishinsky then said that the Persian delegate considered that the negotiations between Persia and Russia "should somehow be placed under the control of the Security Council, and the Council be kept informed of the result", but "if the Soviet Government is to remain under the control of the Security Council, I emphatically deny any such possibility. This would not be in conformity with the dignity of the Soviet Government". There were no real grounds to support the attitude of the Persian Government.

M. Taqizadeh asked to speak again, and denied M. Vishinsky's statement that he had said there had been negotiations.

Mr. Bevin read Article 4 of the treaty of 1942 laying it down that the presence of foreign forces in Persia would disturb the administration and the Persian security forces, the economic life of the country, the normal movements of the population, and the application of Persian law and regulation as little as possible; yet it was the Soviet Government, said M. Vishinsky, which decided that the number of police and soldiers in Azerbaijan was sufficient to keep order.

They had promised not to interfere with Persian sovereignty, but the Russians, on their own admission, had stopped Persian troops from going to Azerbaijan. The issue was: were they stopped or not? If they were, that infringed the treaty. He went on: "This thing did look to us in this country as a war of nerves. It did really look very much like the description laid down, and quoted by the Persian Government, of M. Litvinov's declaration of what constitutes the beginning of an aggression". He ended by urging the Soviet Government to leave the matter on the agenda.

After the American, French, Australian, and other delegates had spoken, M. Vishinsky maintained that only if relations between Persia and Russia were endangering security or peace could the Council accept a recommendation that the question be kept on the agenda. If it remained there that meant the Council should study it, but the Council could do that only if there were no results from the negotiations. He argued, with warmth, that the case was "only a manifestation of the same distrust which has prevented in the past true and cordial relations between the United Nations. To eliminate this distrust is the first task of this Organization. We must come to a true understanding among ourselves and the implementation of the great principles embodied in

the Charter. Therefore I absolutely object to the proposal to maintain this question on the agenda".

Mr. Bevin assured him that it was not a question of distrust, or anything of that kind; it was trying to keep to the Charter that he was concerned about. Until the results of the negotiations were reported to the Council the matter remained before them. Under Article 36 of the Charter they were bound to see this thing through.

Feb. 1.—M. Trygve Lie was elected Secretary-General of the United Nations by 46 votes to 3 at a special meeting of the Assembly.

The Security Council dealt with the Soviet charges against British actions in Greece. M. Vishinsky's main points were: His Government had made repeated representations to British Ministers on the matter, without effect: at Yalta, Potsdam, London, and the Moscow Conference of Three. The presence of British troops was not justified by any need to preserve communications or drive out an enemy. The British authorities had failed to keep any kind of order, and the presence of British troops had now become a means of pressure on the political situation. The Greek Government took an attitude that might endanger peace and even threaten war against Albania and Bulgaria.

What happened in Greece now, the horrors perpetuated through the white terror, was widely known to everyone, and he read out telegrams and articles reporting acts of terrorization purporting to "prove that in the Peloponnese and in the whole country there is an entirely prepared plan by the Monarchist and Fascist organization". As to the argument that the presence of British troops helped to maintain public order "it is obvious", he said, "that the maintenance of order in a given country is entirely a domestic matter". "What happens in Greece", he went on, "has nothing to do with order . . . It has been said that if British troops were withdrawn the Fascist element would refrain from nothing. On the contrary, British troops are used as a bulwark by Royalist and Fascist elements to explain in some way the terror which goes on being perpetrated."

As to the troops being there in accordance with the wishes of allied Governments, this was not true now that the war was over.

Mr. Bevin said M. Vishinsky's description of the difficulties in Greece pointed to the imperative necessity of putting more British troops there. As to Soviet representations, at Yalta Marshal Stalin asked for information about Greece, and was given it. Next day he said he did not wish to interfere; he had complete confidence in British policy there. At Potsdam attacks on British policy started. A British Government statement was circulated there including reports from F.-M. Alexander and the Trade Union delegation that went to Greece. At the meeting on July 31 M. Molotov, having read these, agreed to drop the matter. That ended the situation at Potsdam, but whenever the problem of Greece arose in any negotiations with Russia it had always come about that they discussed Rumania, or Bulgaria, or Poland.

The same thing happened in London, and after the discussion in London he was told by M. Molotov that he would hear no more from the Soviet about Greece. When they got to Moscow in December they

found Greece and Indonesia had been put on the agenda—though not on an agreed agenda circulated beforehand—but after a discussion it was agreed that they should only be the subject of an informal exchange of views. He saw M. Molotov on Dec. 18 and gave him a full explanation about Greece, and M. Molotov did not press the matter further and did not ask that any specific action should be taken.

He was glad it was now going to be debated in the open, because “the British Government have been charged through that extraordinary organization called the Communist Party, which seems to act with great unanimity in every country of the world at the same time by some mysterious methods to attack Great Britain. And, indeed, I know that when I displease the Soviet Government our shop stewards who are Communists in this country send me resolutions on exactly the same thing.”

Mr. Bevin then recapitulated shortly what had happened after the formation of the all-party Government, including E.A.M., and said it was agreed at the Adriatic meeting that British administrators and troops should go into Greece and help revive the country, turn the Germans out, and seek to get civil government re-established. This was done in agreement with Marshal Stalin. A Labour Party conference in London in the Coalition Government's time had agreed that what Britain was doing in Greece was right.

When they went into Greece a civil war broke out, started primarily by Communists seeking to establish a minority government to control the country. The world ought to know the circumstances that produced the present bitterness between Left, Right, and Middle. He then read an independent report put to the Trade Union Congress which declared that E.L.A.S. troops did not try to pursue the retreating Germans, but moved in the opposite direction, to seize power in Athens. The report described atrocities committed by E.L.A.S., and paid tribute to the courage, restraint, and steadfastness of British troops.

They could have put in a minority Government, but what they did was to ask Greece to find her own Government. They knew there would be difficulties, but they thought that democracy must come from the bottom and not from the top.

As there was a treaty of friendship between Britain and Russia he would have thought that there would have been something said through diplomatic channels before coming to the Security Council. But there had not been one communication. He then reminded the Council that, as to Kalamata, there were no British troops in the vicinity at all. In fact, M. Siantos complained to the British Ambassador of the failure of those troops to be there and prevent what took place, i.e. the Right accused them of protecting the Left.

Their chief wish was to get their troops home, but the Greek Government over and over again had said “We must get a stable Government. We must get an election, and you must help us do it”. The U.S.A., France, and Britain agreed to do this, but the Soviet Government had refused an invitation to take part in the supervisory work and see that there would be no disturbances.

M. Vishinsky talked about attacks on neighbouring countries. When there were incidents on the frontier "I proposed a four-party commission", said Mr. Bevin, "but I had no response". The Greek army was small. Bulgaria had an army of well over 100,000 men mobilized. Yugoslavia had 300,000 mobilized, and in Bulgaria there was also a very large Russian army. Could anyone imagine Greece with the aid of the British army, a small number, attacking either of those countries? He had asked in Moscow that they should reduce their armies in Austria, where, he believed, there were over 400,000 troops—what for, he did not know.

He had had some difficulty in believing that the Soviet charge was brought because of what they were doing in Greece; he felt there was a deeper reason, which could only be known to the Soviet Government.

It had been said that he had encouraged a kind of Fascist police. Actually the police in Greece had been organized on the basis of the London Metropolitan Police, which he did not think could be accused of being a Fascist organization. They had lent Greece one of their greatest generals, whose duty it was to help them build up a non-political army which would respect the authority of the Government. As for the articles and telegrams referred to by M. Vishinsky, the article he quoted was very biased, uncorroborated, and not borne out by the facts. The total number of people imprisoned in Greece now was 16,000, including criminals on all charges. The "thousands of Greeks interned in North Africa" actually numbered less than 1,000, mutineers during the war, and even they were being speedily repatriated. In any case, he could not find anything in the Charter to say an action of this kind was entitled to be brought before the Security Council.

He concluded by saying he wanted a straight declaration from the Council—there was no question of compromise in this: Was the British Government endangering the peace in lending some of its forces to help keep order and making economic reconstruction? He was entitled to an answer, yes or no. "It has been", he said, "the incessant propaganda of Moscow and the incessant propaganda of the Communist Party in every country in the world to attack the British people and the British Government as if there has been no friendship between us. That is the danger to the peace of the world. . . ."

M. Aghnides said the people of Greece had never regarded the presence of British troops as a condition imposed on them from outside or as an act attributable to British initiative, but always as a consequence of a request by the Government and an agreement signed by representatives of all political parties. The Government stated categorically that neither the military nor civil authorities of Britain had sought to intervene in any manner in their internal affairs. The Government also regarded the continued presence of British forces as indispensable, inasmuch as it constituted an important factor in the continuance of public order, peace, security, and equal rights for all.

As for allegations that Greece was contemplating attacks on Albania and Bulgaria, this he knew nothing about. That those two countries

helped Germany and Italy when they invaded Greece was not an allegation or hypothesis, but belonged to history. The incidents mentioned by M. Vishinsky were press or agency reports.

Feb. 2.—Hr. Lie was sworn in as Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The Sub-committee inspecting proposed sites for the U.N. headquarters announced, in New York, that its first choice was a rural area of 42 square miles near Greenwich and Stamford, Connecticut, and part of it in New York State.

The President of the Assembly received a cable from the Palestine Arab Higher Committee appealing to U.N.O. to stop the immigration of 1,500 Jews a month agreed to by the British Government as it was an "infringement of our existence within our homeland".

THE SOVIET LETTER TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL *re* PERSIA

THE following is the text of a letter dated Jan. 25 from M. Vishinsky to the President of the Security Council:

The delegation of the Soviet Union, acting on behalf of the Soviet Government, considers it necessary in connection with the appeal of the Iranian Delegation addressed to the Security Council to make the following statement:

The allegation of the Iranian delegation of interference by the Soviet Union through its officials and through the armed forces in the internal affairs of Iran is in contradiction with the reality and lacks any foundation. In this particular case the Iranian delegation repeats the statement made by the Iranian Government to the Soviet Government in November, 1945. This statement, however, was categorically refuted by the Soviet Embassy in Iran in its Note of Nov. 26.

It should be noted also that in its reply of December, 1945 the Iranian Government not only failed to disprove the facts referred to in the Soviet Note of Nov. 26 but also expressed, as is stated in the above-mentioned Iranian Note, its satisfaction in connection with the fact, which was confirmed by the contents of the reply Note of the Embassy, that the interference of the Soviet officials into the internal affairs of Iran in northern regions is not in accordance with the facts.

Moreover, in the same Note, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Iran "expressed its satisfaction at the fact that, as has been pointed out, the Soviet officials fully respect the tripartite agreement and the declaration of the leaders of the three Great Powers allied with Iran, signed and published in Teheran".

These facts bear witness quite convincingly to the incorrectness and groundlessness of the statement of the Iranian delegation regarding the alleged interference on the part of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Iran.

Equally in contradiction with reality is the statement of the Iranian delegation concerning the fact that the Iranian Government has attempted to initiate negotiations on the above-mentioned question with the Soviet Government which were fruitless. The above-mentioned facts refute this statement of the Iranian delegation because the Iranian Government not only attempted to negotiate but actually did negotiate with the Soviet Government on this question, as can be seen from the Iranian Note of Dec. 1 referred to above.

The Soviet delegation considers it necessary to point out that the Iranian Government is trying to use the presence of foreign troops in Iran in order to represent this fact as a violation of Iranian sovereignty and as a cause of the events which are taking place in Iranian Azerbaijan. As a matter of fact, the presence of Soviet troops on the territory of Iran is quite legitimate in so far as such a right was granted to the Soviet Government by the Soviet-Iranian treaty of February, 1921, and Soviet-British-Iranian treaty of 1942.

The events in Iranian Azerbaijan have no connection with the presence there of Soviet troops, and this is confirmed by indisputable and quite objective facts. These events are of an exclusively Iranian and internal nature. As is known, what is happening in Northern Iran is a demonstration of the aspiration of the population of Northern Iran for national autonomy within the limits of the Iranian State and of the achievement of the wishes of the local population, which is nothing unusual for a democratic country.

At the same time the Soviet delegation cannot fail to draw attention to the fact that propaganda hostile to the Soviet Union is growing stronger in Iran and is far from being discouraged by the Iranian Government. This propaganda does not differ in any sense from the Fascist propaganda which was instigated against the Soviet Union at the time of Reza Shah.

Anti-democratic and pogrom activity on the part of the reactionary forces in Iran hostile to the Soviet Union, which is supported by certain influential Iranian groups drawn from the ruling classes and the police authorities, creates for Azerbaijan and for Baku a danger of organized hostile actions, diversions, and so forth.

Such a situation cannot be tolerated. However, the Soviet Government thinks that such questions which affect the relations between two neighbouring States, the U.S.S.R. and Iran, can and should be settled by means of bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Government and the Iranian Government. The Soviet Government did not and does not refuse to accept this method of settling such disputes arising between neighbours.

In view of these facts, and taking also into consideration that, in this particular case, the conditions envisaged by articles 34 and 35 of the Charter of the United Nations Organization are not present, the Soviet Delegation regards the appeal of the Iranian Delegation to the Security Council as lacking grounds and categorically opposed to the consideration of the above-mentioned appeal of the Iranian Delegation by the Security Council.

MR. TRUMAN'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

MR. TRUMAN, in a Message to Congress, on Jan. 21, said that with the growing responsibility of modern government to foster economic expansion and promote conditions that assured full and steady employment opportunities, it had become necessary to formulate and determine the Government programme in the light of national economic conditions as a whole. The beginning of the year found the United States strong and deservedly confident. For the immediate future the business prospects were generally so favourable that there was danger of such feverish and opportunistic activity that grave post-war problems might be neglected. As a result of the war they had become a land of great responsibilities to all the people of all the world, and they must squarely recognize and face the fact of those responsibilities.

The United Nations Organization now being established represented a minimum essential beginning. The ultimate security of the nation required more than a process of consultation and compromise; it required that they now began to develop U.N.O. as the representative of the world as one society.

On the domestic scene they must lay a new and better foundation for co-operation. Among the many and urgent problems they had to face, industrial peace between management and labour would have to be achieved—through the process of collective bargaining—with Government assistance, but not Government compulsion. The owner and management side of business must recognize that its reward resulted from the employment of the resources of the nation . . . it must adhere to national standards in the conduct of its affairs, including as a minimum the establishment of fair wages and fair employment practices. Labour also had its own new peace-time responsibilities. Under their collective bargaining system, which must become progressively more secure, labour had attained increasing political as well as economic power. Their ultimate objective—towards which all others led—was to improve the welfare of the American people.

There lay before them now the work of building a just and enduring peace. Their most immediate task towards that end was to deprive their enemies completely and forever of their power to start another war, and also to preserve the war-time agreement of the United Nations and to direct it into the ways of peace. If difficulties were to arise among the United Nations the United States did not propose to remove them by sacrificing its ideals or its vital interests, but neither did they propose to ignore the ideals and vital interests of their friends.

One of the chief accomplishments of the inter-American conference in February-March, 1945 in Mexico City was an understanding to be put into effect in full accord with the Charter of U.N.O., that an attack by any country against any one of the sovereign American Republics would be considered an act of aggression against them all, and that joint action would be taken. They had solemnly dedicated themselves and all their will to the success of U.N.O., and had sought to ensure that smaller nations should have a voice, as well as the larger States, in the

peace-making. If peace were to endure it must rest upon justice no less than upon power. The chance of achieving justice would be increased when everyone directly interested was given a voice, though not necessarily an equal voice.

Mr. Truman went on to repeat the twelve fundamental points of the foreign policy of the United States, first announced by him on Oct. 27, 1945,¹ which remained the foreign policy of the country. He went on to say that he believed the Allied Control Council for Germany had achieved encouraging progress in the face of most serious difficulties. It was the United States' purpose at the earliest practicable date to transfer from military to civilian personnel the execution of their participation in the government of occupied territory in Europe.

As regards Japan, the United States, with the full approval of its partners, had retained primary authority and primary responsibility, which it would continue to exercise until the Japanese people, by their own freely expressed choice, decided upon their own form of government. America's basic policy in the Far East was to encourage the development of a strong, independent, united, and democratic China, which had always been the traditional policy of the United States. It was also their purpose to proceed as rapidly as practicable towards the restoration of the sovereignty of Korea and the establishment of a democratic government there.

Mr. Truman went on to refer to the appalling devastation and human misery in so many quarters of the world, and declared that by participation in the work of U.N.R.R.A. the United States had assumed an obligation to give such relief assistance as was practicable to the victims of the war.

Turning to their foreign economic policy, he described it as designed to promote their own prosperity and at the same time to aid in the restoration and expansion of world markets and to contribute to world peace and security. Their economic prosperity and the prosperity of the whole world were best served, in their view, by the elimination of artificial barriers to international trade, whether in the form of unreasonable tariffs or tariff preferences, or commercial quotas, or embargoes, or the restrictive practices of cartels. The U.S. Government had issued proposals for the expansion of world trade and employment, intended to form the basis for a conference to be held in the summer.

World security and world prosperity could not be secured without the full co-operation of the United States, and to play their part they must not only carry out the foreign policies they had adopted, but follow a domestic policy which would maintain full production and employment in the United States, since a serious depression there could disrupt the whole fabric of world economy. It was necessary for their national safety and the security of the world that they should maintain substantial armed forces, particularly in oversea service, and they were conducting recruiting drives to enable them to maintain these forces, while relieving those who had already done their duty overseas. They estimated that a year hence they would still need about two million in

¹ See the *Chronology of International Events*, Vol. I, No. 9, p. 200.

the armed forces, and it would be necessary by additional legislation to extend the Selective Service Act beyond May 16, the date of expiration under the existing law.

There still existed many critical shortages resulting from the war which might lead to a speculative boom, especially in the price of securities, real estate, and inventories, and their chief worry was therefore inflation. Better human relationships were an urgent need to which organized labour and management should address themselves, since, while the Government could help to develop machinery which would assist labour and management to resolve disagreements in a peaceful manner, they could not make men understand each other, agree, and get along together.

Finally, there was no question in his mind that the Government, acting on behalf of all the people, must assume responsibility for the economic health of the nation, since no other agency could do that. The Federal Government must gear its policies to the objective of full production and full employment—to raise consumer purchasing power and to encourage business investment.

The Royal Institute of International Affairs is an unofficial and non-political body, founded in 1920 to encourage and facilitate the scientific study of international questions. The Institute, as such, is precluded by the terms of its Charter from expressing an opinion on any aspect of international affairs. Any views expressed in this publication are, therefore, not those of the Institute.